

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 6-10 and 13-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over by U.S. Publication No. 2006/0067190 A1 issued to Kurobe et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,526,014 B2 issued to Masaki et al. Claims 4, 5, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurobe in view of Masaki and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0130993 A1 issued to Nadershahi. Claims 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurobe et al in view of Kubota et al and further in view of WO 2003/091935 A3 issued to Stan. Applicants have amended Claim 1 and canceled Claims 8 and 9. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

Applicants have amended Claim 1 to incorporate the elements recited by canceled Claim 9. The Examiner admits that Kurobe and Masaki fail to disclose storage of an adjusted write strategy on a hard disk drive, as recited by amended Claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 as well as Claims 2-7 which depend from Claim 1.

Claim 10 recites, in part, “averaging the determined power setting variations for the locations to determine an adjusted write strategy.”

Claim 18 recites, in part, “an OPC (Optical Power Calibration) engine interfaced with the write strategy table, the OPC engine operable to determine a write strategy for an optical medium from the write strategy table and to adjust the determined write strategy’s write power setting by performing test writes and reads at plural distributed locations of the optical medium, determining the power setting at each location that had the lowest read amplitude and jitter variations, and averaging the determined power settings to determine the adjusted write power setting.”

Kurobe and Masaki cannot make obvious Claims 10 and 18 because Kurobe and Kubota fail to teach, disclose or suggest all elements recited by Claims 10 and 18. Both Claims 10 and 18 recite averaging power settings found at plural areas. The Examiner bases the rejections of Claims 10 and 18 on Figure 18B, however, Figure 18B discloses averages used for a single

location, not different locations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 10-21 are fully allowable over Kurobe and Masaki.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to deduct any additional fees which may be necessary and to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502264.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically submitted to the COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS via EFS on May 15, 2007.

/Robert W. Holland/

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert W. Holland/

Robert W. Holland
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 40,020